

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 18, 19 and 21-24 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 11 and 19 have been amended and claim 25 has been cancelled. Further reconsideration of this application is requested.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

The grounds of rejection of record are traversed to the extent they may be applied to the claims as amended, and also for reasons of record as explained in the prior amendment.

Claims 1 and 19 have been further limited by amendment to require each bar detector strip having a width dimension adapted to face a source of gamma photons, and a depth dimension orthogonal to said width dimension, wherein said width dimension is smaller than said depth dimension. This feature is described in the application as published at paragraph 0023.

As explained, because the slat collimators collimate gamma photons in only dimension, high position resolution is required only in the dimension perpendicular to the collimated bars. Thus, a narrow width bar may be used. See paragraphs 0024, 0026 of the published application.

In contrast, Zeng fails to teach the use of bar detector strips with the claimed dimensions. Fig. 4 shows detector elements 106 with width dimension Cx and depth dimension Cz. Zeng is silent as to the dimensional values (see col. 7:26-28), however Cx and Cz appear in Fig. 4 to be equal. Further, the embodiment shown in Fig. 8 discloses detector elements 106 having a width dimension that is greater than a depth dimension.


Claim 11 has been amended to require that only one photodetector be attached to one end a bar detector strip normal to an elongated dimension, and a light collection optimizing surface treatment applied to the other end of the bar detector strip normal to said elongated dimension, which surface treatment optimizes light collection by said one photodetector. Support for this amendment is found in the specification at paragraph 0031 of the application as published. Neither Zeng nor Miraldi teach or suggest this feature.

Additionally, for the record the outstanding grounds of rejection remain traversed. Although the Office action states that the specific arrangement in Zeng of the optical communication of the photodetector to the scintillation detectors 106 is left "as a choice within the ordinary skill the art," those skilled in the art reading Zeng would understand that the photodetectors must be located in the detector head 22, which is below the scintillation detectors 106. This conclusion is supported by the explanation in Zeng that the back edge 107b of the slats 102 is proximal the radiation receiving face 23 of the detector head 22. See Col. 7:16-18; Col. 10:22-23; Figs. 4, 5A, 5B and 8. Because the radiation receiving face 23 receives radiation from the scintillation detectors 106, a photodetector by definition would be located at the radiation receiving face 23. For this reason, while Zeng does not illustrate photodetectors, those skilled in the art would have understood from the disclosure that Zeng teaches such photodetectors are mounted in the detector head 22, so as to receive radiation at the radiation receiving face 23, which is below the collimator and not adjacent to the collimator.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, further reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of the outstanding grounds of rejection, and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is requested.

Please charge any fee or credit any overpayment pursuant to 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Novak Druce Deposit Account No. 14-1437.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,					
NAME AND REG. NUMBER	Vincent M. DeLuca Attorney for Applicants Registration No. 32,408				
SIGNATURE				DATE	11 January 2008
Address	Novak, Druce, DeLuca + Quigg LLP 1300 I Street, N.W., Suite 1000 West Tower				
City	Washington	State	D.C.	Zip Code	20005
Country	U.S.A.	Telephone	202-659-0100	Fax	202-659-0105